

REMARKS/ ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11-17 and 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,428,406 (hereinafter "Andrew") in view of U.S. Patent 5,532,744 (hereinafter "Akiwumi-Assani").

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). (MPEP ¶ 2143.03).

Independent claim 1 of the present application includes limitations not suggested or taught by Andrew or Akiwumi-Assani. As a result, claim 1 is patentable over Andrew in view of Akiwumi-Assani.

Specifically, claim 1 of the present application includes the limitation of "assigning, via a first processor of a group of processors sharing said memory, at least one independent slice per processor to be decoded by the processors in parallel, *including assigning a varying number of slices to individual processors.*"

Andrew nor Akiwumi-Assani disclose *assigning a varying number of slices to individual processors*. For example, Andrew discloses partitioning the *blocks* of a frame

into their horizontal rows, and *all the blocks* of a row are processed in left to right order by a *single DSP*. (Andrew, column 7, line 55-58.) Other wise said, Andrew is limited to disclosing *encoding* digitized video images by which blocks are divided into their horizontal rows and all the blocks of a row are processed in left to right order by a *single DSP*.

As such, claim 1 of the present application is patentable over Andrew in view of Akiwumi-assani because it includes limitations not suggested or taught by Andrew or Akiwumi-assani.

Applicant's additional independent claims 9 and 17 of the present application include similar limitations as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. As a result, applicant's independent claims 9 and 17 would also be patentable over Andrew in view Akiwumi-assani, for the reasons set forth above.

In addition, claims 3-8, 11-16 and 19-24 depend from the independent claims discussed above, and therefore include the limitations of the referenced independent claims. As a result, claims 3-8, 11-16 and 19-24 include the distinguished limitations, as discussed above, and are therefore patentable over Andrew in view of Akiqumi-assani.

CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call John Ward at (408) 720-8300, x237.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 8/19/03


John P. Ward
Reg. No. 40,216

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300

Appl. No. 09/470,299
Amdt. dated _____
Reply to Office action of June 19, 2003